

Appl. No. 10/075,311  
Final Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to final Office action of 28 June 2005

Page 4 of 6

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1-6, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ishihara (EP0588019) and Bae et al. (USP 5,247,194, hereinafter Bae); and  
claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ishihara, Bae, and Bonnett et al. (USP 6,075,506, hereinafter Bonnett).

The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Because the applicants' prior remarks have been ineffective in overcoming these rejections, the applicants herein retract any and all remarks regarding Ishihara, Bae, or Bonnett.

The Examiner's attention is requested to MPEP 2142, wherein it is stated:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*... If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness."

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-9 depend, claims a display device that includes a pulsed backlight system, wherein the display device is configured to increase the switching rate of pixels in the sequence of selecting the pixels during operation.

Neither Ishihara, Bae, nor Bonnett, teach a display device that includes a pulsed backlight system, wherein the display device is configured to increase the switching rate of pixels in the sequence of selecting the pixels during operation.

As taught by the applicants, in a pulsed backlight system, a full image is first provided to the display and, after the last picture line has been addressed, the light source is caused to emit a short intense light pulse. This causes a problem, however, because "the pixels associated with the picture line addressed as the first line have had a longer time to reach a stable final state than the picture lines addressed at a later stage. This results in a reduced picture quality from the picture line addressed as the first line towards the picture line addressed as the last line." (Applicants' page

Appl. No. 10/075,311  
Final Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to final Office action of 28 June 2005

Page 5 of 6

1, lines 11-18.) To correct this problem, the applicants teach a pulsed backlight display device that is configured to increase the switching rate of pixels in the sequence of selecting the pixels during operation, thereby reducing the difference in time at which the pixels reach a stable final state.

The Office action relies upon Ishihara for teaching a pulsed backlight. The applicants respectfully disagree. Ishihara teaches a backlit display device, but does not teach that the backlight is a pulsed backlight system as specifically claimed by the applicants. The Office action references page 6, lines 1-3 of Ishihara for teaching a pulsed backlight system. The cited text follows:

"As shown in Fig. 3, the liquid crystal display includes a backlight 21, an inverter 22, a transformer 23, a fan 24, a power source 25 for the backlight, a diffuser 26, the liquid crystal panel 27 and a driving circuit 28. The backlight 21, the inverter 22, the transformer 23, the fan 24, etc. are disposed so as to assemble a module..." (Ishihara, page 6, lines 1-4).

As can be seen, Ishihara teaches a backlight 21, but does not teach a pulsed backlight 21, as specifically claimed. As is known in the art, a pulsed backlight is synchronized with the display controller; absent a "pulsed backlight" designation or any reference to a coupling of the backlight 21 to a display controller, the assertion that Ishihara's backlight 21 is a pulsed backlight is insupportable.

Because the prior art relied upon by the Office action (Ishihara) fails to teach a pulsed backlight, as specifically claimed in independent claim 1, the applicants respectfully maintain that the Office action fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and thus the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are unfounded, per MPEP 2142.

**Appl. No. 10/075,311**  
**Final Amendment and/or Response**  
**Reply to final Office action of 28 June 2005**

**Page 6 of 6**

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott  
Reg. 41,508  
Att'y for Applicant(s)

1824 Federal Farm Road  
Montross, VA 22520  
Phone: (804) 493-0707  
Fax: (215) 243-7525